"LEO, ANTHEMIUS, ZENO, AND EXTRAORDINARY SENATORIAL STATUS IN THE LATE FIFTH CENTURY"[1]

RALPH W. MATHISEN / UNIV. OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The period c.457-491 brought great changes to both the eastern and western sections of the Roman Empire. The dynasty of Valentinian and Theodosius, established in 364, had provided some regularity of imperial succession to both the east and west for nearly a century. But the deaths of Valentinian III in the west in 455, and of Theodosius II in 450 and Marcian in 457 in the east, brought this appearance of stability to an end. In the west, one then encounters a series of nine "shadow" emperors, none of whom ruled for more than a few years.

In the east, on the other hand, Marcian's successor, the tribune Leo, obtained the throne as the candidate of the master of soldiers Aspar[2]. In 466, the Isaurian chieftan Tarasicodissa, otherwise known as Zeno, appeared in Constantinople and soon began to make a name for himself. He married Leo's daughter Ariadne, and a son, Leo II was born in 467[3].

In the same year, Leo named the patrician and master of soldiers Anthemius to be emperor of the west, where there had been an interregnum since the death of Severus in 465. As the son-in-law of the previous emperor Marcian, Anthemius would have offered at least some semblance of a connection to the old dynasty. Meanwhile, in the east, the elder Leo died in 474. Young Leo II then became emperor, and later in the same year his father Zeno was made co-emperor[4]. Little Leo did not last long after-

1 This research was supported by a fellowship from the George A. and Eliza Gardner Howard Foundation. My thanks, also, to Profs. Barry Baldwin, Timothy Barnes, and Walter Kaegi for providing helpful suggestions and criticism.

2 For all of these personages, see the appropriate entries in *PLRE II*.

3 For Leo's son, see Gilbert Dagron, "Le fils de Léon Ier (463). Témoinages concordants de l'hagiographie et de l'astrologie", *Analecta bollandiana* 100 (1982) pp. 271-275; see also David Pingree, "Political Horoscopes from the Reign of Justinian", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 30 (1976) pp. 135-150

wards.

All three of these non-dynastic emperors, Leo, Anthemius, and Zeno, had come to power under somewhat irregular circumstances, and all three had reason to feel shaky on the throne. All three also introduced some innovations which were intended to strengthen their positions. Some of these measures involved grants of extraordinary status to individuals whose support they needed or desired. A detailed investigation of them will suggest that, at least in some regards, eastern and western practices paralleled each other, even in the 470s, to a greater degree than has previously been thought.

During the Later Roman Empire, Roman senators and potentates became ever more status conscious as they competed with each other for rank and status. Senators looked to the emperor as the bestower of this status. The variations among the ranks of different senators became increasingly finely defined. The distinctions among *viri clarissimi, viri spectabiles,* and *viri inlustres,* for example, are well known. Other innovations included fine distinctions among the ranks granted to different offices, to the dates of priority of the holding of offices, and to the holding of multiple offices.

Yet one more distinguishing mark was introduced by the granting of strictly honorary titles and offices[5]. One of them was the patriciate, which initially had been introduced by Constantine I (A.D. 306-337)[6]. In its new form, the title no longer was an here-

4 See John P.C. Kent, "Zeno and Leo: The Most Noble Caesars", *Numismatic Chronicle* 19 (1959) 93-98. For Zeno, see Bury, *LRE* pp. 389-428; E.W. Brooks, "The Emperor Zenon and the Isaurians", *English Historical Review* 8 (1893) p. 217ff etc; Jones, *LRE* pp. 224-230.

5 For the ranking of actual versus honorary offices, see *CJ* 12.8.2, of Theodosius II and Valentinian III (A.D. 440/441), which distinguishes between two kinds of honorary offices, those granted "praesentes a nostro numine sine cingulo" and those granted "absentes ... sine cingulo". They ranked behind offices "in actu", "vacantes... praesentes", and "absentes [with] cingulum". For discussion, see Jones, *LRE* p. 535.

6 On the patriciate, see T.D. Barnes, "Patricii Under Valentinian III", *Phoenix* 29 (1975) pp. 155-170; Stephen Brassloff, "Patriciat und Quaestur in der römischen Kaiserzeit", *Hermes* 39 (1904) pp. 618-629; Wilhelm Ensslin, "Aus Theoderichs Kanzlei. 1. Zur Formula Patriciatus in Cassiodors Variae VI 2", *Würzburger Jahrbücher* 2 (1947) pp. 75-85, "Der konstantinische Patriziat und seine Bedeutung im 4. Jahrhundert", *Mélanges Bidez* 1 (1934) pp. 361-376, and "Zum Heermeisteramt des spätrömischen Reiches. III. Der magister utriusque militiae et patricius des 5. Jahrhunderts", *Klio* 24 (1931) pp. 467-502; R. Guilland, articles reprinted in *Titres et fonctions de l'Empire byzantin* (London, 1976) and *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines* vol. 2 (Berlin/Amsterdam, 1967); Wilhelm Heil, *Der konstantinische Patriziat,* Basler

ditary one of a privileged upper class, but became rather an honorary title, held for life, which conveyed very high status[7]. At that time, it was outranked only by the consulate[8]. For the rest of the fourth century, however, the patriciate seems to have been little used[9]. During the fifth century, patriciates appeared more often. Then, toward the end of the fifth century, still another honorary distinction appeared: the honorary consulate.

The uses of the patriciate, and the circumstances under which it was granted, varied greatly[10]. Initially, it had been used to reward personal favorites who were otherwise undistinguished, but who had some close connection with the imperial family[11]. Subsequently, during the first three quarters of the fifth century (as seen in the Table), it was granted only to individuals of illustrious rank, usually consulars or masters of soldiers, in both the east and west.

One variation seems to be that in the west there usually was only a single *patricius et magister militum praesentalis* (or

Studien zur Rechtswissenschaft 78 (Basel/Stuttgart, 1966); B. Kubler, "Patres, Patricii", Paully-Wissowa-Kroll, *Real Encyclopädie* 18.4 (1949) col. 2231-2232; G. Magliari, "Del Patriziato Romano dal Secolo IV al Secolo VIII", *Studi e Documenti di Storia e Diritto* 18 (1897) pp. 153-217; W. Ohnsorge, "Der Patricius-Titel Karls des Großen", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 53 (1960) pp. 300-321; G.B. Picotti, "Il 'patricius' nell' ultima età imperiale e nei primi regni barbarici d'Italia", *Archivio Storico Italiano* 9 (1928) pp. 3-80; and E.A. Stückelberg, *Das constantinische Patriciat. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der späteren Kaiserzeit* (diss. Zurich: Basel/Geneva, 1891).

7 But for patrician "families" see Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 5.16.4, where he refers to his and Ecdicius' "utramque familiam ... patriciam" and *Epist.* 2.3.1, congratulating the new patrician Magnus Felix because "in lares Philagrianos patricius apex tantis post saeculis tua tantum felicitate remeaverit". Note also *CIL* 6.1725 = *ILS* 1284, of Fl. Olbius Auxentius Draucus (*PLRE II* p. 380), described as "v.c. et inl. patriciae familiae viro"; his patrician relative is not known. It clearly was felt that patrician rank reflected added lustre upon an entire family.

8 *C.Th.* 6.6.1 (1 April 382).

9 Only a few patriciates can be attested with certainty for the fourth century; see Barnes, "Patricii" pp. 169-170.

10 One of the difficulties in studying the patriciate is that there is no list of patricians included among the otherwise exhaustive collections of fasti at the back of volumes one and two of *PLRE*.

11 There was a long tradition of using the patriciate to raise the status of imperial relatives. Precedents include Julius Constantius, the half-brother of Constantine I and the first known patrician (*PLRE I* p. 226), and Petronius, the father-in-law of Valens (ibid. pp. 690-691). Another imperial brother-in-law to be made a patrician is Secundinus, brother-in-law of Anastasius (*PLRE II* p. 986); three of Anastasius' nephews received the honor as well (Probus 26, Hypatius 6, and Pompeius 2: qq. vv. in *PLRE II*).

magister peditum or *magister utriusque militiae*) at any given time, whereas in the east, any number of masters could be patricians concurrently[12]. Moreover, in the west, such grantings of the patriciate were clearly associated with the primary mastership, whereas in the east, the grants of each usually were not connected to each other[13]. Nor, in the east, did all masters of soldiers necessarily become patricians[14]. And the patriciate also seems, on occasion, to have been granted to ambassadors, that is, to those who spoke on behalf of an emperor[15].

This study will investigate the effects that the granting of these honorary ranks had upon the relationship between the emperors and the senatorial aristocracy during the latter half of the fifth century[16]. Just how often, by whom, to whom, and why were

12 The granting of the title "patrician" to the highest ranking master of soldiers in the west has long been recognized; see Norman H. Baynes, "A Note on Professor Bury's History of the Later Roman Empire", *Journal of Roman Studies* 12 (1922) pp. 207-229; Alexander Demandt, "Magister militum", Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Real-Encyclopädie* supp. 12 (1970) col. 553-790; and Wilhelm Ensslin, "Zum Heermeisteramt des spätrömischen Reiches. III. Der magister utriusque militiae et patricius des 5. Jahrhunderts", *Klio* 24 (1931) pp. 467-502. The sole attested exception is that of Sigisvult, who was patrician in the mid 440s at the same time that he was *magister utriusque militiae* (presumably subordinate to the patrician Aetius: see *PLRE II* p. 1010). What often has escaped notice is the extent of the practice in the eastern empire as well.

13 But note Procopius, of whom Sidonius said (*Carm.* 2.89-90), "suscipit hinc reducem duplicati culmen honoris / patricius nec non peditumque equitumque magister / praeficitur castris" [in 422]; and Anthemius, of whom he said (ibid. 205-7), "hinc reduci datur omnis honos, et utrique magister / militiae consulque micat, coniuncta potestas / patricii..." [c. 455]. In the latter case, *PLRE II* (pp. 96-7) assigns various dates of 454-455 to these honors; Sidonius makes it clear that they occurred at the same time. In both cases, Sidonius clearly concected the grants of the mastership and the patriciate, but Sidonius, of course, is a western writer, and he may have done so as a matter of course: note that Sidonius assumes that Procopius was *magister utriusque militiae*, where he was in fact *magister militum per Orientem*. No eastern source ever makes such a connection between the patriciate and the mastership.

14 Contrary to the assumption of Anderson, *Sidonius* 1.14 n. 1, "In the eastern Empire there were five such officers ... They all received the patriciate sooner or later". Fifth-century eastern masters of soldiers not attested as patricians include Martinianus (*PLRE II* p.730); Longinus (*PLRE II* pp. 689-90); Fl. Ioannes qui et Gibbus (*PLRE II* pp. 617-618); Theodoricus Strabo 5 (*PLRE II* pp. 1073-6); Fl. Jordanes (*PLRE II* pp. 620-621); Ioannes Scytha 34 (*PLRE II* pp. 602-3); Onoulphus (*PLRE II* p. 806); and Sabinianus Magnus 4 (*PLRE II* p. 967).

15 See R. Mathisen, "Patricians as Diplomats in Late Antiquity", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 79 (1986) pp. 35-49.

16 Although there is evidence for other honorary offices, such as the

they granted?

One might begin a study of extraordinary senatorial status in the fifth century in general, and of the significance of these honorary ranks in particular, with some numbers. In the Table, well-attested patricians are listed under the emperor most likely to have granted them their patriciates[17]. It can be seen that under the last emperors of the Valentinianic dynasty, known patriciates were granted at almost exactly the same rate — 0.35 per year — in both the east and west. Furthermore, these patricians were almost exclusively high-ranking potentates, who earlier had obtained illustrious rank by the holding of an illustrious office. Under Theodosius II, ten of the fourteen were consuls and/or masters of soldiers. Of the remaining four, at least two seem to have obtained their patriciates in the context of embassies (Helion and Merobaudes). The other two, Lausus and Antiochus, as *praepositi sacri cubiculi,* presumably were imperial favorites with personal ties to the imperial family.

Four patricians could have been created by either Theodosius or Marcian; all but one likewise were either consuls or masters of soldiers. Only one patrician, Anthemius, is known for certain to have been made such by Marcian, and he was Marcian's son-in-law[18]. Marcian, therefore, followed the policy of Theodosius, and was perhaps even more sparing in his grants of extraordinary status: for the years 450-456, of eight eastern ordinary consuls, only one (the same Anthemius) is known ever to have become a patrician[19].

In the west, during the years circa 415-445 all the known

prefecture, none are certainly known (see *PLRE II* pp. 1252, 1292-1295). An especially common honorary rank, which had been introduced by Constantine in three grades, was the *comitiva.*

17 The dates, and the circumstances, of the granting of most patriciates are not exactly specified in the sources. Often, all that is known is that an individual was a patrician by such-and-such a date. This makes the study of the patriciate inherently more inexact than studies of other high-ranking honors.

18 The chronology is given by Sidonius (*Carm.* 2.193-209): Anthemius married Aelia Marcia Euphemia, then, as *comes,* campaigned on the Danube, then, after his return, was made master of soldiers, consul (in 455), and patrician. If, as was normal, he was named consul in the previous year, his return would have been in 454. His marriage then would have been c.450/453 (*PLRE II,* p. 423, dates it to "c.453").

19 See Guilland, "IVe", p. 151, "les textes mentionnent peu des patrices sous le règne de Marcien". Marcian survived less than a month into 457; Fl. Constantinus (cos 457) did become a patrician, but only after 457 (*PLRE II* 317-8).

patriciates were granted to masters of soldiers only. The mid 440s, however, brought a spate of grants to influential senators, nearly all of whom at one time or another also were consuls. It might be noted that the surge of patriciate-granting at this time also was paralleled in the east. It appears that these grants resulted from a period of status-seeking by senators of the highest rank in both east and west[20]. Between the death of Valentinian in 455, however, and the accession of Anthemius in 467, only one non-military patrician, Basilius, can be identified with certainty.

The ratio of patriciates granted to generals and to senators, moreover, also was almost the same in both the east and west at this time, approximately 1:1. These close correlations presumably were not entirely fortuitous, but must have reflected some shared attitudes about how frequently, and to what kinds of individuals, grants of the patriciate should be made.

After the death of Marcian in the east, however, one detects a change at least in the frequency of grants of honorary ranks. Under Leo and Zeno, the rate of known grants of the patriciate more than doubles, to 0.86 per year. In the west, under the short-lived Anthemius, it soars to over one patrician per year[21]. Furthermore, under Leo and Zeno one finds no less than nine honorary consuls being named. One might wonder whether these changes result from something more than mere statistical aberrations.

With regard to Leo, most, if not all, of his grants of the patriciate (and these include those which were made by either Leo or Zeno) were conventional: to very high ranking senators of illustrious rank. In one way, however, Leo does seem to have expanded upon, and combined, some of the precedents of the past. In the fourth century, some grants of the patriciate had been made to otherwise undistinguished imperial relatives. This practice, which seems to have fallen into abeyance as of Theodosius I, appears to have been revived during the 450s. Marcian, as already noted, had made his son-in-law Anthemius, a patrician. And Leo seems to have continued this trend. He granted, or is likely to have

20 As evidenced by two enactments from the reigns of Theodosius II and Valentinian III devoted to senatorial precedence, *CJ* 12.3.1 (undated) and *Nov. Val.* 11 (13 March 443).

21 And this at a time when most of the other "shadow" emperors are not known to have granted any patriciates at all.

granted, the patriciate to his son-in-law Zeno[22]; to another relative by marriage, Julius Nepos[23]; and to two of the sons of his colleague Anthemius: Fl. Marcianus, who also became Leo's son-in-law c.471[24], and Procopius Anthemius[25].

Which now brings us to the emperor Anthemius. His marriage to Marcian's daughter apparently had given him some sort of claim on the throne, which eventually had come to nought[26]. Nevertheless, he would have remained a potential embarrassment, especially after several military successes. In 467, therefore, Leo found a novel way to deal with him: by making him emperor of the west during a western interregnum.

The first thing to note in any consideration of Anthemius' imperial policies is that he was an easterner. The first easterner, in fact, to rule in the west in the fifth century. As a result, one might

22 Zeno became patrician circa 471/474, probably closer to 474 (see *VDanStyl.* 66 [471: probably anticipation], 67 [474]; Malal. *Chron.* 375-6, *Chron. Pasch.* s.a. 474). Zeno also was *MVM per Thracias* 467/8?-469, *MVM per Orientem* 469-471, *MVM praesentalis* by 474 (probably in 473): see *PLRE II* pp. 1200-1202. He also was consul in 469 with Anthemius' son Fl. Marcianus.

23 For Nepos, see below.

24 Marcianus (*PLRE II* pp. 717-718, no. 17) married Leo's daughter Leontia c.471/474 after the murder of Aspar in 471: she had been married to Aspar's son Patricius. He then appears as patrician and *MVM praesentalis* c.471/474: *PLRE II* dates the patriciate to after the marriage, but Malalas, *Chron.* 375 (cf. Zon. 14.1.13), has him as patrician at the time of the marriage. In 479 he revolted against Zeno and occupied the palace, but he hesitated to be proclaimed emperor and was defeated. He was forcibly made a priest, escaped, was again defeated, captured, and imprisoned in Isauria. He later was sent by Illus to Italy 484 to seek help from Odovacar, and was not heard from again.

25 He was involved in Marcianus' revolt of 479, and fled to Theoderic Strabo in Thrace and thence to Rome. He returned under Anastasius, and became consul in 515 (*PLRE II* p. 99). Another Anthemius (*PLRE II* p. 98) who appears at this time was married to the *patricia* Herais (*PLRE II* p. 543) as of 475/6. Presumably, her title came from her husband. She subsequently bore a son, also named Zeno, who before 492 was betrothed to the emperor Zeno's niece Longina (*PLRE II* p. 686). Now, it seems unlikely that two Anthemii would exist at the same time, one the son of ex-emperor with a connection to imperial family, and another, a patrician, otherwise unknown, also with a connection to imperial family. The two, therefore, likely are the same, indicating that Procopius Anthemius was a patrician by the mid 470s. For other female patricians at this time, note Caesaria 3 (*PLRE II* pp. 248-9); Georgia (*PLRE II* p. 503); and Anicia Juliana 3 (*PLRE II* pp. 635-6), the wife of Areobindus 1: *PLRE* notes, "her husband is not known to have been *patricius*, but she may have received the title in her own right, being of imperial family". Another possibility of course, is that the distinguished Areobindus may have been a patrician after all.

26 Sid.Apoll. *Carm.* 2.210-11, "iamque parens divos: sed vobis nulla cupido / imperi; longam diademeta passa repulsam / insignem legere virum [sc. Leonem]".

expect that some of his grants of office, titles, and status would reflect eastern rather than western practices — and that sometimes there might have been a conflict between them. A few examples bolster this suspicion.

Anthemius himself, in fact, was a "patrician and master of soldiers" upon his arrival. Several sources draw attention to his patriciate in their discussions of his elevation outside Rome on 12 April 467. Marcellinus *comes* notes that "the emperor Leo sent the patrician Anthemius to Rome and established him as emperor"[27]. And Jordanes discloses that "the emperor Leo sent his patrician Anthemius to Rome, establishing him as emperor"[28]. Both emphasized Anthemius' status as patrician, and Jordanes even utilized the more western usage, calling him "Leo's patrician."

Anthemius' titulature would have created something of an anomaly in Italy: the western patrician Ricimer already held those titles, and in the west it was customary to have only one "patrician and master of soldiers" at a time. For Anthemius, there would have been no difficulty, for multiple masters of soldiers with the patriciate were common in the east; one can only guess how well Ricimer liked the idea. Any antagonism may have been only partially resolved by Anthemius' assumption of the higher rank of augustus, and by Ricimer's marriage to Anthemius' daughter Alypia.

Any hierarchical complications of this nature would have been compounded by the presence in Anthemius' retinue of a number of other influential individuals. One such was Marcellinus of Dalmatia. Hydatius reports that, "Anthemius, having been sent from Constantinople by the emperor Leo to Italy with Marcellinus and other chosen comrades ... ascends the throne"[29]. Marcellinus had been a commander in Dalmatia in 454, and perhaps had been named master of soldiers in Dalmatia by Majorian by 461[30]. In

27 "Leo imperator Anthemium patricium Romam misit imperatoremque constituit" (Marcell. *Chron.* s.a. 467).

28 "Leo imperator ... Anthemium patricium suum ordinans Romae principem destinavit..." (Jord. *Get.* 235).

29 "de Constantinopoli a Leone Augusto Anthemius ... cum Marcellino aliisque comitibus viris electis ... ad Italiam ... directus ascendit" (Hyd. *Chron.* s.a. 467, no. 234). See *PLRE II* pp. 708-710.

30 See Roberto Cessi, "Marcellino e l' opposizione imperiale romana sotto il

468, he was in command of the imperial troops in Sicily, in which capacity he was referred to by Marcellinus *Comes* as "Marcellinus, patrician of the west"[31]. Although it is not specified who granted the patriciate to Marcellinus, his close association with Anthemius suggests that it was the latter who did so[32].

The presence of Marcellinus as yet another western "patrician and master of soldiers" may have ruffled Ricimer's feathers all the more, and created another uncomfortable anomaly, this one unresolved[33]. Marcellinus then became the commander of the imperial forces in Sicily in the coordinated campaign against the Vandals, a campaign in which Ricimer's role was notable by its absence. One might well suspect that Ricimer had a hand in the murder of his rival Marcellinus later in 468.

Anthemius also made a number of grants of the patriciate to civilians. At least some of them seem to have been conventional in nature, made to high-ranking members of the Italian senatorial order. One of them, Fl. Messius Phoebus Severus, seems to have been a protégé of Anthemius[34]. He had gone to Alexandria, disillusioned with public life, but had returned after Anthemius' accession in 467, "With the favor of the emperor, ... to restore Rome." Anthemius made him consul and *praefectus urbi* in 470, by which time he also was a patrician. He well may have received this status from his patron, Anthemius.

Another interesting case is that of Romanus, who was executed for conspiracy in 470. About him, John of Antioch noted (fr.207), "The emperor of the west, having fallen into a serious illness on account of magic, punished many of those involved in this, especially Romanus, who had served in the office of master and had been enrolled among the patricians, and had been particularly

governo di Maioriano", *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 75 (1915-6) pp. 1475-90.

31 "Marcellinus Occidentis patricius" (Marcel. *Chron.* s.a. 468); his patriciate is confirmed by Jord. *Get.* 239, s.a. 474, "Nepos Marcellini quondam patricii sororis filius".

32 *PLRE II* (p. 709) suggests that "Marcellinus was perhaps given a similar office by Anthemius to counterbalance [Ricimer's] power".

33 Even though Ricimer would have been *patricius et magister utriusque militiae*, whereas Marcellinus, presumably, would merely have been *patricius et magister militum per Dalmatias*.

34 *PLRE II* no. 19, pp. 1005-6. See the *VIsidori* fr. 64 = Phot. *Bibl.* 242. 64.

helpful in these matters to Ricimer"[35]. Now, it is not certain that Romanus received his patriciate from Anthemius, but John's wording suggests that he thought that this was the case. And the reign of Zeno will provide many examples of newly made patricians turning on their benefactor.

A number of Anthemius' other grants of the patriciate, however, were decidedly unorthodox in nature — at least from the western point of view. They were made not to Italians, but to Gauls, none of whom had held any illustrious offices before the reign of Anthemius. And this at a time when Gauls were rarely, if ever, granted honors by the Italian government.

In 467, Sidonius Apollinaris traveled to Rome on an embassy on behalf of the Auvergne. On 1 January 468 he delivered a panegyric to Anthemius on the occasion of the latter's assumption of the consulate. Thereafter he was made both *praefectus urbi Romae* and patrician by Anthemius[36]. Another Gaul, Magnus Felix, also was made patrician, as well as praetorian prefect of Gaul[37]. One can only imagine how well the Italian aristocracy liked the extension of these high ranks north of the border.

Nor was Anthemius' munificence limited only to Gallo-Romans. Gallic barbarians also seem to have benefited. The

35 *PLRE II* p. 947. According to Cassiodorus, "Romanus patricius affectans imperium capitaliter est punitus" (Cass. *Chron.* s.a. 470); see also Paul. Diac. *Hist. Rom.* 15.2, "Romanus patricius imperatoriam fraudulenter satagens arripere dignitatem praecipiente Anthemio capite caesus est".

36 "ut sicut nos utramque familiam nostram praefectoriam nancti etiam patriciam ... reddidimus, ita ipsi quam suscipiunt patriciam faciant consularem" (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 5.16.4). Note also *Epist.* 9.16.3 vv. 17-32, where Sidonius cites the two primary honors of his life: 1) the statue granted him by the senate for his panegyric to Avitus in 456, and 2) the office granted him by Anthemius. Sidonius must have considered his patriciate to have been subsumed under one of these two honors, and because under Majorian, in 461, Sidonius was not yet of illustrious rank (*Epist.* 1.11), and because Gaul was in revolt against Severus (461-465), the next emperor who could have granted the patriciate would have been Anthemius.

37 *PLRE II.* pp. 463-464. Described as a "vir patriciae dignitatis" (Gennad. *Vir. ill.* 86). See also Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 2.3.1, "nam licet in praesentiarum sis potissimus magistratus et in lares Philagrianos patricius apex tantis post saeculis tua tantum felicitate remeaverit", which indicates that the two honors were granted at the same time. For 469 as the date, see A. Loyen, *Sidoine Apollinaire et l'esprit précieux en Gaule aux derniers jours de l'empire* (Paris, 1943) p. 84; *PLRE II*; C.E. Stevens, *Sidonius Apollinaris and His Age* (Oxford, 1933) p. 196; and K.F. Stroheker, *Der senatorische Adel im spätantiken Gallien* (Reutlingen, 1948) #145. J. Sundwall, *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des ausgehendes Römertums* (Helsingfors, 1919) p. 77 #172, however, suggests a date of c. 474-5.

Burgundian king Chilperic is referred to as a "vir inlustris Galliae quondam patricius" in 468. He cannot have been first magister militum at this time (Ricimer was), but he may have been *magister militum per Gallias,* in which capacity he was serving in 474[38]. So who granted him these dignities?

Julius Nepos is unlikely to have made Chilperic master of soldiers in 474, for the two seem to have been in conflict[39]. Furthermore, the patriciate is unlikely to have been granted with the mastership before Anthemius, because, as already seen, it was not western policy to have two generals as patricians at same time. Nor are there any previous western examples of grants of the patriciate to barbarians who were not generals. The most economical hypothesis would seem to be that Anthemius, looking for support, and especially military support, in Gaul to counter Ricimer, made Chilperic both patrician and master of soldiers in Gaul[40]. This additional instance of Anthemius making another of his generals patrician may well have alienated Ricimer all the more.

Nor were Sidonius, Felix, and Chilperic the only Gauls whom Anthemius enticed with high honors. For one thing, it seems that some Gauls were merely promised the patriciate. In 474, Sidonius' brother-in-law Ecdicius had been made patrician, and, it seems, master of soldiers, by Nepos[41]. Sidonius then wrote to his

38 Patrician: *VLupicini* 10; see R. Mathisen, "Resistance and Reconciliation: Majorian and the Gallic Aristocracy after the Fall of Avitus", 7 (1979) pp. 597-627. *Magister militum*: Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 5.6.2, "magistro militum Chilperico", *PLRE II* (p. 287) assumes not only that the patriciate alluded to the post of *MVM per Gallias,* but also that both reports dated to "(473?-)474". For other discussions of Chilperic, see A. Demandt, "Magister militum", in Paully-Wissowa-Kroll, *Real-Encyclopädie* supp. 12 (1970) cc. 694-5; Ensslin, "Patricius" p. 493; E. Stein, *Geschichte des spätrömischen Reiches* vol. 1 (Vienna, 1928) p. 571; L. Schmidt, *Geschichte der deutschen stämme bis zum Ausgang der Völkerwanderung, vol. 1. Die Ostgermanen* (Munich, 1934) p. 142. It must be noted that Anthemius' use of eastern practices means that Chilperic's patriciate tells nothing about which mastership he held.

39 A relative of Sidonius was acused of trying to betray Burgundian Vaison to Nepos (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 5.6).

40 Other considerations in support of this hypothesis: Anthemius' partisan Sidonius' influence with Chilperic at this time (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 5.6) and the flight of Anthemius' allies, the Bretons, to the Burgundians (presumably those of Chilperic, not of Gundobad) after their defeat by the Visigoths (Jord. *Get.* 237-8, "fugiens, ad Burgundionum gentem vicinam Romanisque in eo tempore foederatam advenit").

wife Papianilla, Ecdicius' sister, "The patrician honor has arrived.... Julius Nepos blessedly has finally paid off, with a speed exceeded only by his praiseworthiness, that which the promise of Anthemius had owed to the efforts of your brother; indeed the one has fulfilled the repeated pledge of the other"[42]. The efforts to which Sidonius referred probably concerned Ecdicius' defeat of the Goths in the early 470s, at the very end of Anthemius' reign. Anthemius, therefore, might not have had the opportunity to put any promises into effect[43].

One probably can safely presume that Ecdicius was not the only one to whom Anthemius made, or even fulfilled, such a promise. The Belgic generalissimo Syagrius sometimes is reported to have been a patrician; Anthemius may have been his benefactor, too[44]. At the same time, it may be Anthemius' reputation for granting patriciates that led to the apparent assumption by another contemporary source, Hydatius, that Ricimer's own patriciate had been granted by Anthemius[45].

Anthemius' application of eastern practices in the west, including his use of multiple patricians and masters of soldiers as well as his liberality in his grants of the patriciate to potential supporters in Gaul, both Romans and barbarians, would not have endeared him to the existing western power structures. His enmity with Ricimer is well known; nor was he popular with the Italian

41 Ecdicius' mastership is inferred from Jord. *Get.* 241, "quod audiens [sc. fuga Ecdicii], Nepus imperator praecepit Ecdicium relictis Galliis ad se venire loco eius Orestem mag. mil. ordinatum" (see Ensslin, "Patricius" p. 495ff). Sundwall, *Abhandlungen* pp. 71,38, has Ecdicius as *magister militum per Gallias* c.472-474, but Sidonius (*Epist.* 5.16.1) clearly has him as a *privatus* at that time.

42 "honor patricius accedit ... hoc tamen sancte Iulius Nepos ... quod decessoris Anthemii fidem fratris tui sudoribus obligatam, quo citior, hoc laudabilior absolvit; siquidem iste complevit, quod ille saepissime pollicebatur..." (*Epist.* 5.16.1-2).

43 Although Loyen, *Sidoine* 2.216, suggests that Ecdicius as *patricius* might have been displeasing to the Burgundians.

44 Fred. *Chron.* 3.15, "Romanorum patricius"; cf. *LHF* 8, as "Romanorum rex", and Chilperic's appellation of "patricius Galliarum" (discussed above). See Demandt, "Magister militum" col. 692, who suggests that Syagrius probably recognized Anthemius and usurped the rank, although, given Anthemius' penchant for granting patriciates, one might wonder whether this would have been necessary. See also Stroheker, *Adel* p. 40 n. 207 and G. Tamassia, "Egidio e Siagrio", *Rivista storica italiana* 3 (1886) pp. 193-234.

45 Note the reference, under the year 469, to the report of legates that "Rechimerum generum Anthemii imperatoris et patricium factum" (*Chron.* s.a. 469).

senatorial aristocracy, to whom he was known as the "little Greek"[46].

Of course, his decision to court the Gauls in this manner probably only indicates his own realization of his lack of Italian support, and his need to look elsewhere. And his choice of an essentially empty means of showing his appreciation indicates the degree to which imperial authority in Gaul now lacked the ability to provide more concrete forms of recompense.

In the end, Anthemius' lack of success in the west is demonstrated by his defeat by Ricimer, and subsequent murder by Ricimer's nephew (it seems) and protégé, the Burgundian general Gundobad[47]. The family tie may help to explain Gundobad's adherence to Ricimer, and his brother Chilperic's to Anthemius, although other local dynastic considerations may well have been more important factors in their choosing of sides[48]. Nor were Anthemius' policies preserved in the west: in the future, the western patriciate would be limited almost exclusively to Italian senators of the highest rank.

But if Anthemius' policies left no legacy in the west, his lesson was not lost upon another outsider who soon succeeded to the eastern throne in 474: Zeno. A number of factors induced Zeno to make grants of several kinds of extraordinary status on a much wider scale than before. For one thing, Zeno was an unpopular emperor. Like Anthemius, he was essentially a foreigner in his own imperial capital. His rule was not welcomed. He was disliked by the people, disdained by the senatorial aristocracy, and had only a shaky hold on the loyalty of the army. His reign was replete with intrigue, and he suffered through no less than three revolts,

46 Ennod. *VEpiphanii* 54, "Graeculus". Even Sidonius (*Epist.* 1.7.5) referred to him as the "Graecus imperator".

47 See *Chron. gall. 511* no. 650, where Anthemius is killed "a Ricimere genero suo vel Gundebado"; Joh. Ant. fr. 209.1 has Anthemius beheaded by "Ricimer's brother" Gundobad. According to Malal. *Chron.* 14.374-375, "Ricimer summoned from Gaul Gundobad, son of his sister, where he was master of soldiers ... and with Anthemius killed, he then returned to Gaul" (according to this confused account, Ricimer then made Olybrius emperor, then Majorian, and then "another senator, called Nepos, was raised to the imperium of the west by Ricimer"). In reality, Gundobad remained in Italy and became patrician after the death of Ricimer: "Gundobadus patricius factus est ab Olybrio imp." (*Fasti vindob. prior.*: *MGH AA* 9.306).

48 Their discord also is attested by Gundobad's later murder of Chilperic (Greg. Tur. *H.F.* 2.28).

those of Basiliscus (475-6), Marcian (479), and Leontius (484-488). But he also proved to be remarkably durable.

In 475, for example, Leo's brother-in-law Basiliscus — a past master of soldiers who had attained the honors of consul, patrician, and *caput senatus* — revolted and was supported by a number of eastern potentates, including Epinicus, Armatus, Illus, and Illus' brother Trocundes[49]. Zeno, however, not only was able to induce all four to change sides, but he also gained the support of the Ostrogothic chieftan Theoderic, son of Theodemir[50].

After Zeno's restoration in 476, he loaded his supporters down with honors. Over the next few years, Illus, Trocundes, and Theoderic were given the ordinary consulate (in 478, 482, and 484 respectively: Armatus had already held it in 476), and Epinicus was made honorary consul[51]. Illus[52], Trocundes[53], Armatus[54], Epinicus[55], and Theoderic[56] all were made patricians. Illus was made *magister officiorum,* Armatus was promised the office of "master of soldiers for life," and Armatus' son, also named Basiliscus, was made Caesar[57]. Illus and Theoderic became the "friends" (*filoi*) of the emperor[58]. And Theoderic was

49 For Basiliscus as "primus senator" in 474, see *Anon. Val.* 9.41. The introduction of the *caput senatus* is assigned by Chastagnol, *Sénat* p. 54, to Zeno's activities of 476-480. E. Stein, "Untersuchungen zum Staatsrecht des Bas-Empire", *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Romanistische Abteilung* 41 (1920) pp. 195-251 at p. 235-8, suggests that the title was initiated by Odovacar, but see Stein, *Geschichte* 2.788, for the existence of the title in Constantinople as of 471.

50 Note Jones, *LRE* p. 230, for Zeno as "a merciful man by nature".

51 These grants of the ordinary consulate by Zeno become all the more noteworthy in light of his apparent reluctance to grant it to senators: except for the consulate of Fl. Eusebius in 489, the consulates of Illus, Trocundes, and Theoderic are the only ones held by easterners under Zeno who were not members of the imperial family (Cameron et al., *Consuls* p. 8). It has been suggested that Eusebius was himself imperial (ibid. p. 513).

52 Illus' rewards are listed by Mal. *Chron.* 385, who referred to him as "patrician ... the *filos* of the emperor ... having been raised to the senatorial and patrician dignity, and also having been made consul and master".

53 Listed as patrician in *A.E.* 1969/70 no. 609; the patriciate is listed between the offices of master of soldiers (476/7-482) and consul (482).

54 Mal. *Chron.* 382 is the only source; *PLRE II* notes, "if correct, the title was given him by Zeno after his restoration".

55 As patrician and honorary consul in Dessau, *ILS* 8845(b) from Phrygia; he is not yet a patrician in *CJ* 10.15.1 of 1 September 475.

56 For Theoderic, see below.

57 *PLRE II* p. 149; Bury, *LRE* p. 393.

58 Malal. *Chron.* 386; Malch. fr. 18. The term "filos" seems to refer to

adopted by Zeno in the Germanic military manner and was given some sort of triumph in Constantinople "for the purpose of exalting his rank"[59].

At the same time, Zeno had to make some quick decisions about his policies in the west. One involved the status of Julius Nepos, a potentially troublesome legacy he had inherited from Leo. Nepos, the nephew of the aforementioned Marcellinus and a relative by marriage of Leo, was already *patricius* and *magister militum per Dalmatias* in 474[60]. Now, John of Antioch (fr.209), claims that "when Leo, the emperor of the east, learned of the election of Glycerius [in 473], he appointed Nepos as general of an expedition against him."

The *Anonymous Valesianus* (7.36), however, offers a slightly different version: "At the order of the emperor Zeno at Constantinople, therefore, the patrician Nepos, arriving at the port of the city of Rome, deposed Glycerius from the emperorship, and he was made bishop and Nepos was made emperor at Rome"[61]. Given that Zeno had been made emperor on 9 February 474, and that Nepos was not named emperor at Rome until late June, it would appear that Nepos' campaign not only had been initiated by

something beyond its mere generic usage.

59 *Anon. Val.* 11.49 (c.476/489), "Zeno itaque recompensans beneficiis Theodericum, quem fecit patricium et consulem, donans ei multum...", see also Malchus fr. 17 (478), "he was made friend and son", and fr. 18 [476/478], "the emperor made you his 'friend' and he grandly outfitted you with the honors which the Romans consider most distinguished" and "[Adamantius] ... recalled to him the honors granted by the emperor, that he had made him patrician and general". See also Jord. *Get.* 289, "et post aliquod tempus ad ampliandum honorem eius in arma sibi eum filium adoptavit de suisque stipendiis triumphum in urbe donavit, factusque consul ordinarius ... et equestrem statuam ad famam tanti viri ante regiam palatii conclocavit" (before 489). For the process of *adoptio per arma,* see D. Claude, "Zur Begründung familiärer Beziehungen zwischen dem Kaiser und barbarischen Herrschern", in Evangelios Chrysos and Andreas Schwarcz eds., *Das Reich und die Barbaren* (Vienna/Cologne, 1989) pp. 25-56.

60 Malch. fr. 10. *PLRE II,* p. 777, suggests that Nepos may have become master of soldiers as early as 468, after the death of his uncle. On Nepos, see also John P.C. Kent, "Julius Nepos and the Fall of the Western Empire", *Corolla Numismatica Memoriae Erich Swoboda Dedicata* (Cologne, 1966) pp. 146-150.

61 "igitur imperante Zenone Augusto Constantinopoli superveniens Nepos patricius ad Portum urbis Romae deposuit de imperio Glycerium et factus est episcopus et Nepos factus imperator Romae". Marcellinus *Comes* (*Chron.* s.a. 474) notes that Glycerius was expelled by "Nepos, son of the sister of the one-time patrician Marcellinus", and that Nepos then was made emperor at Rome.

Leo, but also had been confirmed and supported by Zeno[62]. Zeno, who still was merely co-emperor with his son Leo II, well may have been happy to rid himself of a potential rival in this manner.

But there remains the question of Nepos' patriciate. He is called a patrician only in the context of his deposition of Glycerius, only in western sources, and only in the western sense of "The (i.e. Zeno's) Patrician"[63]. All of which might suggest that he also was acting in the capacity of western "patrician and master of soldiers." After all, Gundobad, who previously had held this post, seems to have returned to Gaul before Nepos' arrival, so there was no known western incumbent[64].

Finally, one might note that no source specifically states that Leo-cum-Zeno's intention had been for Nepos to become western emperor[65]. Nevertheless, Zeno did claim in 477 that "of the two emperors whom [the westerners] had received from the east, they had expelled one [Nepos] and had killed Anthemius" (Malch. fr.10). The implication here seems to be that both were formal candidates of eastern emperors. Certainly, Zeno recognized Nepos' claim, nor is there any indication that it ever was in doubt.

Shortly thereafter, Zeno had to deal with another bothersome development in the west: Odovacar's seizure of authority in Italy[66]. Odovacar, it will be recalled, in 476 had been proclaimed

62 Zeno was made emperor on 9 February (*PLRE II* p. 1202). Nepos' assumption of the throne is dated variously to June 19 (*Auct. Haun.*) and June 24 (*Fast. Vind. prior*). *PLRE* assumes that Nepos was only sent by Leo (*PLRE II* 777-8). Malalas, *Chron.* 375, ludicrously asserts that "the senator Nepos" was a candidate of the now-dead Ricimer.

63 *Anon. Val.* uses it only in western sense (also of Orestes), and *Auct. Haun.* s.a. 474 has Glycerius deposed by "the patrician Nepos".

64 See Malal. *Chron.* 374-375; and *PLRE II* p. 524.

65 It usually is simply assumed that Nepos was an eastern imperial candidate; see Gordon, *Attila* p. 126.

66 On Odovacar and the east, see Bury, *LRE* pp. 406-8; Carlo Cippola, "Considerazioni sul concetto di stato nella monarchia di Odoacre", *Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, Scienze morali* 20 (1911) pp. 353-468; W. Ensslin, "Zu den Grundlagen von Odoakers Herrschaft", *Serta Hoffilleriana* (Zagreb, 1940) pp. 381-388; A.H.M. Jones, "The Constitutional Position of Odoacer and Theoderic", *Journal of Roman Studies* 52 (1962) pp. 126-130; Michael McCormick, "Odoacer, Emperor Zeno and the Rugian Victory Legation", *Byzantion* 47 (1977) pp. 212-222; and John Moorhead, "Theoderic, Zeno and Odovacer", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 77 (1984) pp. 261-266. For Odovacar and the aristocracy, see O. Bertolini, "L'aristocrazia senatoria e il Senato di Roma come forza politica sotto i regni di Odoacre e di Teoderico", *Atti del I Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani* vol. 1 (Rome, 1929) pp. 462-475; and A. Chastagnol, *Le sénat romain sous le règne d'Odoacre. Recherches sur*

"king" of the German mercenaries in Italy and had forced the young usurper Romulus into retirement. He then sent an embassy to Zeno, declaring his loyalty and asking to be recognized as "patrician"[67]. Zeno, who just had recovered his throne, responded in a manner congruent with his other grants of high status in the east, and was only too happy to oblige.

Small matter if the title "patrician" meant two different things to Odovacar and Zeno. Odovacar presumably would have seen himself as the successor to patricians such as Ricimer, Gundobad, and Nepos himself. But it is in the context of Zeno's grants of the patriciate in the east, rather, that one probably should interpret his handling of Odovacar. For Zeno, the title would have merely been consistent with his policy for consolidating his position in the east. Odovacar was but one more supporter to be conciliated after a period of difficulties. In order to maintain appearances, Zeno did recommend that Odovacar properly should receive the title from Nepos. But, just in case Nepos had not already done so, Zeno also took the responsibility himself.

Such grants of rank and status for the purpose of appeasing or rewarding one's friends and allies vastly exceeded anything known to have been done by any emperors of the previous dynasty. It needs to be noted, however, that in this regard Zeno was merely following the lead of Anthemius, who just a few years earlier had used grants of honorary ranks for the same purpose in the west. The use by them both of this policy, moreover, at least suggests that the demand for this kind of status was there. They were merely filling the need.

But Zeno's use of honorary ranks went beyond the propitiation of potential supporters: he also used them as a means of enhancing the status of his representatives. In 474, for example, a certain Severus was sent as ambassador to Carthage, and according to Malchus he was made patrician beforehand, "So that he might make a more majestic impression"[68]. Zeno, it would appear, per-

l'épigraphie du Colosée au Ve siècle (Bonn, 1966).

67 Malch. fr. 10: see *PLRE II* pp. 791-793.

68 Malch. fr. 3, cf. Vict. Vit. 1.51. On Malchus, one of the best extant sources for the reign of Zeno, see B. Baldwin, "Malchus of Philadelphia", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 31 (1977) 91-107, who dates the work (p. 91) to the reign of Anastasius.

haps because of his own dubious origins, was even more sensitive than his predecessors had been to questions of status, not only his own, but also that of his agents.

A similar case may be that of Pelagius, a *silentiarius* who in 479 had been Zeno's ambassador to Theoderic Strabo[69]. By 490, he had been raised to patrician status, although without, it seems, having held any other offices: he is described as a "high-ranking *silentiarius*, having come into the patriciate" (Malal.*Chron.* 390). But there must be more to him, because in 490 he was executed as a result of a rumor that he aspired to the throne[70].

Other indications as well attest Zeno's propensity for granting honors. When Alexander, envoy to Huneric in 480/1, returned with envoys from Huneric promising peace, "Zeno freely received the legates and attended to them with appropriate honor: he dismissed them deservedly adorned with gifts, and he made Alexander *comes rei privatae*"[71].

Still other persons were granted unspecified high honors by Zeno. His son, also named Zeno, was said to have been "advanced through the honors"[72]. And Theoderic Strabo demanded c.478 "that he regain the same dignities that he had obtained under Basiliscus"[73]. These honors were duly confirmed by Zeno. In both cases, one might imagine that the honors included the patriciate. Given Zeno's track record, one would be surprised if they did not.

One other incident in particular demonstrates Zeno's sensitivity about the status of his representatives, which he perhaps saw as a reflection on himself. Malchus relates how, in the context of an-

69 *PLRE II* pp. 857-8; see Malch. fr. 19.

70 Pelagius' patriciate may have been, like Sidonius', related to his literary abilities: he wrote epic poetry (Theoph. *Chron.* 5982-3) and history (Cedr. 1. 621-2).

71 Malch. fr. 13. Zeno also was accused of disbursing Leo's treasury surplus to his friends (Malch. fr. 6).

72 Malch. fr. 9. See *PLRE II* p. 1203 for documents addressed to Fl. Patricius Claudius Zenophanes which mention a "consul ordinarius and patricius", apparently dating to the reign of Leo or Zeno — possibilities include Tatianus (cos 466), Fl Marcianus (cos II 472), Armatus (cos 476), Illus (cos 477), and Trocundes (cos 482).

73 Malch. fr. 17; see *PLRE II* pp. 1073-6. And to the examples already cited, add, for example, Malch. fr. 16, "He [Zeno] decorated most of those who had been sent from the Goth [Theoderic, son of Triarius] with honors".

other embassy, "Zeno sent Adamantius ... a patrician and past prefect of the city [sc. Constantinople], having confered upon him the consular honor as well"[74]. In this case, the patriciate was not enough: Zeno also made Adamantius an honorary consul.

Now, Zeno usually is thought to have been responsible for the introduction of the honorary consulate, and Adamantius to be the earliest example[75]. But there is another candidate. A certain Dioscorus, who was city prefect before 467, and praetorian prefect in 472-5 and again in 489, is described in the *Suda* both as "grammaticus and prefect and consul and patrician" (N 395), and as "grammaticus, prefect of the city and praetorian" (D 1208)[76]. He does not appear in the normal consular fasti, so the consulate presumably was honorary, and his stated cursus could suggest that it was granted c.467/472, under the emperor Leo[77].

This conclusion is supported by other considerations. Dioscorus not only served as the teacher of Leo's daughters, he also, in 467, delivered a panegyric on Leo and Anthemius[78]. He is not known to have had any such ties to Zeno. This evidence, too, indicates that the first known honorary consulate was granted by Leo, and was issued to augment the status of an intimate friend and associate.

Zeno, as already seen, also used the honorary consulate for a

74 *PLRE II* pp. 6-7.

75 See *PLRE II fasti* p. 1246, followed by Cameron et al., *Consuls* pp. 9-10. On the honorary consulate, see also Jones, *LRE* 533 n. 26 (for Zeno's "regulating" it); and Christian Courtois, "Exconsul. Observations sur l'histoire du consulat a l'époque byzantine", *Byzantion* 19 (1949) 37-58. For its introduction by Zeno, see Chastagnol, *Sénat* pp. 54-55; Stein, *Geschichte* 2.68. For the fate of the suffect consulship, see A. Chastagnol, "Observations sur le consulat suffect et la préture du Bas-Empire", *Revue historique* 219 (1958) pp. 221-253. Barnes, "Patricii" p. 162, suggests the possibility that Merobaudes, western master of soldiers in 443, was an honorary consul (see also *PLRE II* p. 758).

76 Dioscorus' honorary consulate is cited by *PLRE II* in the individual entry, but is omitted from the *fasti* of honorary consuls. *PLRE II*, p. 368, does suggest that the *Suda* may have simply been in error, confusing him with F. Dioscorus, consul in 442. But this Dioscorus is not known to have been either a grammarian, or a city prefect, or a consul; it seems unlikely that someone else's consulate would just gratuitously have crept in.

77 The first passage from the *Suda* indicates that the patriciate was received after the city prefecture, and the second, although it fails to mention the consulate and patriciate, shows that the author knew of the praetorian prefecture.

78 Panegyric: Const. Porph. *De cer.* 87. In the very next year, a similar occasion led to the elevation of Sidonius Apollinaris to the patriciate by Anthemius himself.

similar purpose. But, ever the opportunist, he also found a more lucrative use for this honor: as a fund raising technique[79]. He decreed that "all those, who after this are endowed with the insignia of the honorary consulate through imperial munificence, we decree should pay one hundred pounds of gold for the repair of the public aqueduct, in the same manner as those who glory in the performance of consular duties through the space of a year. For it is appropriate for them, too, that the most flourishing city should feel that it is sustained by the munificence of the hundred pounds of gold of the honorary consuls as well"[80]. This law indicates, of course, that the ordinary consuls already were required to contribute a similar hundred pounds of gold to the aqueduct fund[81].

The success of Zeno's measure is indicated by the attested number of individuals who apparently were willing — if not encouraged — to pay the price for this extraordinary honorary status. Some eight likely honorary consuls from the reign of Zeno alone are attested. Some of the many others whose dates are not so firmly attested also may date to the reign of Zeno[82]. At the same time, moreover, the attractiveness of the honorary consulate would have been enhanced by the decline in the number of ordinary consuls who were not imperial family members: no more than four during Zeno's entire reign.

There were, moreover, very real advantages, dating specifically

79 For Zeno as "throughout his reign short of money", and being unable to raise taxes, see Jones, *LRE* pp. 229-230. For the ordinary consulate being "cheapened by the grant of honorary consulates", see Jones, *LRE* p. 533.

80 *CJ* 12.3.3 (undated), "quoniam vero gloriosissimae huic urbi, quae caput orbis terrarum est, omnifariam credimus consulendum, universos, qui posthac honorarii consulatus insignibus principali munificentia decorantur, centum auri libras ad reficiendum aquaeductum publicum ministrare censemus ad similitudinem eorum, qui per annale tempus consularium editione munerum gloriantur. nam ipsis quoque expedit, ut florentissima civitas centum auri librarum munificentia sustentata honorarium quoque sentiat consulatum".

81 For this provision, see also *CJ* 12.3.4, addressed to Zeno's prefect Sebastianus. The reiteration may indicate that ordinary consuls were not complying. A law of Marcian (*CJ* 12.3.2 [A.D. 452]) established that ordinary consuls were to pay 100 pounds of gold for the aqueducts, and attempted to prohibit consuls from scattering largess to the crowds (see also *Nov. Just.* 105 of A.D. 536). And a separate law of Zeno (*CJ* 11.43.8, of 474/479, to the city prefect Adamantius) ordered prefects not to transfer the aqueduct funds to other uses and established an independent *aerarius* to oversee the aqueduct funds.

82 *PLRE II, fasti*, p. 1246, which lists twenty-nine honorary consuls of the late fifth and early sixth centuries. To this list should be added the names of Dioscorus and Pamprepius.

to the reign of Zeno, which accrued from the purchase of the consulate. For one thing, a law issued to the prefect Arcadius c.485/486 decreed specific legal privileges for one who had held the patriciate or the prefecture, for one who was "a consular man, whom either the ordinary procession or the sacred speech of our piety equally has uplifted," and for certain others as well: they could have their appeals heard by the emperor[83]. Moreover, another law, issued to Sebastianus, established that decurions who at any time became patricians, consuls, consulars, or *in actu* prefects or masters of soldiers were freed of their curial responsibilities. This law was confirmed by another one of Justinian which stated clearly that it applied to both ordinary and honorary consuls[85].

Zeno's introduction of such money-making schemes — which, it should be noted, he did in lieu of raising taxes — were vilified by his detractors. Zeno's prefect at this time, Sebastianus, acquired an even greater than usual reputation for venality: Malchus (fr.9) accused him of being a "co-ruler ... hawking everything, as in the marketplace, nor did he allow anything to be carried out in the court of Caesar without a price, but he sold all the offices, allocating part of the price to himself and part to the emperor... Even if Zeno freely granted some office to a close associate, [Sebastianus], like a trafficker in public offices, acquired it from him for a little [price], offered it to others at a greater [price], and presented the loot to Zeno"[86].

The extent of the bestowal of honors, offices, and titles upon Zeno's comrades, therefore, was so great at this time that it was thought deserving of an explanation. And even this hostile account

83 *CJ* 3.24.3, "consulari viro, quem tam ordinaria processio quam sacra nostrae pietatis pariter sublimavit oratio".

85 *CJ* 10.32.67.

86 Wrongly translated by Gordon, *Attila;* for correct rendering, see Bury, *LRE* p. 401 n. 1, who notes Zeno's "reign would have been a good one but for the influence of ... Sebastian, who ... introduced a system of selling offices". Note also *CJ* 12.3.4, addressed by Zeno to this same Sebastianus, which was intended to ensure that all consuls expended their hundred pounds of gold on the aqueducts. See Stückelberg, *Patriciat* p. 55. For Sebastianus, see Jones, *LRE* p. 230. The use of bribery was, of course, common; the innovation here appears to be the surrender of the "take" to the imperial fisc (see Jones, *LRE* p. 394). For the sale of offices in general, see Jones, *LRE* 392-395. According to Malchus (fr. 12), the price paid by the Augustal prefect for his office rose from 40 pounds to 500 pounds of gold.

cannot conceal the fact that much of the revenue acquired by this means found its way into the imperial fisc.

There remains, finally, an interesting piece of legislation. An undated law of Zeno established some very specific regulations about how the patriciate was to be granted: "It shall be permitted to no one to ascend to the sublime honor of the patriciate, which outranks all the others, unless he previously possessed the honor of the consulate, or is known to have carried out the administration of the praetorian prefecture, including that of Illyricum, of the city, of the masterhip of soldiers, or of the mastership of offices, having served, of course, in the actual office, so that it is permitted only to persons of this sort, who perform their administration either now or later, to obtain the rank of patrician"[87].

This decree began by asserting the clear priority of the patriciate over the consulate[88]. This order of ranks never had been explicitly stated before in any extant legislation[89]. One might wonder at the reasons for this stipulation. The answer may lie in the apparent connection between the new policies: the new regulations on the status of the patriciate and purchase of the honorary consulate both were introduced in the same law.

Was the change deemed necessary, perhaps, because the purchase of the honorary consulate would have allowed a rich nobody to outrank all the patricians — a seemingly intolerable situation? The new policy not only would keep this from happening, it also would make the patriciate, bestowed by the emperor, into an even more desirable prize[90].

87 "nemini ad sublimem patriciatus honorem, qui ceteris omnibus anteponitur, adscendere liceat, nisi prius aut consulatus honore potiatur aut praefecturae praetorio vel Illyrici vel urbis administrationem aut magistri militum aut magistri officiorum, in actu videlicet positus, gesisse noscatur, ut huiusmodi tantum personis sive adhuc administrationem gerendo seu postea liceat (quando hoc nostrae sederit maiestati) patriciam consequi dignitatem" (*CJ* 12.3.3).

88 See Heil, *Patriziat* p. 57, "Auch ... wird der Patriziat (vor den Konsuln!) so hoch gestellt wie später nie wieder". Jones, *LRE* p. 1225 n. 28, however, asserts that it was Justinian who gave "priority to patricians over consulars".

89 Although it had been implied in *C. Th.* 9.40.17 of 17 August 399. For other legislation on the status of the patriciate (in these cases, in conjunction with the consulate), see *C. Th.* 6.6.1 (1 April 382); *CJ* 12.3.1 (undated, under Theodosius II and Valentinian III); and *Nov. Val.* 11 (13 March 443).

90 In the west, however, the consulate remained the highest honor; note that under Theoderic, the *Formula consulatus* preceded the *Formula patriciatus* (see Heil, *Patriziat* p. 58). This may have been because the honorary consulate

The reason why Zeno chose to degrade the consulate in this way rather than the patriciate may have been because there was an obvious difference between ordinary consuls and honorary ones[91]. There was no distinction, however, between a "real" patriciate and an "honorary" one. This consideration would allow the emperor to degrade the consulate, while yet maintaining a meaningful distinction among the two different kinds of consuls. He could not do so for patricians.

Finally, if the consulate had been allowed to outrank the patriciate, any incentive to gain the patriciate would have been removed. The opportunity to bestow the patriciate on top of the consulate, whether honorary or ordinary, would have given the emperor one further card to play. And for Zeno, as seen above, the status card was an important one in his deck. It would appear, therefore, that the heightened status of the patriciate was a natural result of the creation and sale of the honorary consulate.

The decree regulating eligibility for the patriciate also has the appearance of restricting the number of individuals eligible to be patricians. Had it resulted from concerns about a debasement of the honor? A study of Zeno's known patriciates does not yield a great number of low-ranking patricians who did not already meet the new criteria. Possibilities would include Severus, the ambassador of 464, and the *silentiarius* Pelagius (if he received his patriciate prior to the issuance of this law). Perhaps grants like these aroused the ire of patricians who had earned their status *in actu*. The new eligibility requirements would allow Zeno to assert that he had tightened the standards for granting the patriciate and thereby made its holders into an even more exclusive group.

But, as always, it might be possible to find in Zeno's crafty nature a more satisfactory explanation. His requirement need not have been intended to limit the number of patriciates — which it clearly did not do— but only to increase revenue. One can only note that he did not require potential patricians to have held the ordinary consulate, only the consulate. It would appear that individuals who did not meet the office-holding requirements had only to pay the requisite hundred pounds of gold for the honorary consulate, and they then would be eligible, at least, for the

seems not to have been used in the west (Cameron et al., *Consuls* p. 10).

91 See Jones, *LRE* p. 535.

patriciate.

This consideration may help to explain the number of individuals known to have been both honorary consuls and patricians as of this time, but not to have held any high office *in actu*. Such persons (with the dates of their honors) include Epinicus (476/8?), Adamantius (by 479), Pamprepius (479)[92], Leontius (by 484), and Isaac 1 (late fifth century)[93]. Of course, not all honorary consuls became patricians[94]. Perhaps some further encouragement, such as an additional contribution, was expected. This, too, could have been another reason for Zeno's specification that the patriciate was to outrank the consulate.

In general, Zeno's grants of high status suggest that he was more an opportunist than an innovator. He did, however, make imaginative extensions of the precedents set by his predecessors. His use of the honorary consulate was adopted from Leo; Zeno just made it into a much more profitable endeavor. And his use of the patriciate as a means of consolidating support and dealing with barbarian potentates seems to have originated with Anthemius.

This aspect of Zeno's policies is only consistent with Malchus' general assessment of his character: "His ambition served as his motive in many things, and whatever he did he did ostentatiously rather than sincerely, for the sake of glory and spectacle" (fr.9). The *Anonymous Valesianus* also mentioned Zeno's preference for form over content, noting that, immediately after his restoration, "Zeno recalled the affection of the senate and the people, and showed himself to be munificient to all, so that all would be grateful to him"[95].

It may be, in part, Zeno's limited resources which encouraged

92 On Pamprepius, see David Pingree, "Political Horoscopes from the Reign of Zeno", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 30 (1976) pp. 135-150 at pp. 144-146; A. Delatte, P. Stroobant, "L'horoscope de Pamprépius, professeur et homme politique de Byzance", *Bulletin de l'Academie Royale de Belgique, Classe des lettres* 9 (1923) pp. 58-76; and R. Asmus, "Pamprepios, ein byzantinischer Gelehrter und Staatsmann des 5. Jahrhunderts", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 22 (1913) pp. 320-347.

93 For all these individuals, see *PLRE II* p. 1246 and their respective entries.

94 Note Florus 3, as well as Justinianus 4 and Marsus 2, honorary consuls by 484 (qq. vv. in *PLRE II*), who may have lost their opportunity for promotion because of their involvement in Leontius' revolt.

95 "Zeno recordatus est amorem senatus et populi, munificus omnibus se ostendit, ita ut omnes ei gratias agerent" (*Anon. Val.* 9.44).

his generosity. Honorary titles were one of the few things he had in abundance. Given his limited resources, he perhaps is to be admired for making the most of what he had. But one can only wonder whether his munificience only served to swell the heads of grantees such as Marcianus, Illus, Trocundes, and Leontius, and perhaps encourage their ambitions. Did short-term appeasement, perhaps, result in long-term complications?

On a broader scale, the parallel activities of Anthemius in the west, and Leo and Zeno in the east, suggest that at least in this sphere the theoretical unity of the empire continued to have some real applications. This is seen not only in the presence of eastern emperors in the west, but also in the migration of policies regarding grants of status back and forth. As incongruous as it may seem to be discussing Gaul and Constantinople in the same breath in the context of the 470s, the aristocrats of both areas continued to have some of the same concerns, and these concerns could be reflected in similar imperial policies by eastern and western emperors. Only later did the even more fundamental incompatibilities between the two areas result in the final break.

In general, Leo, Anthemius, and Zeno all asserted, to a greater degree than in the past, the role of the emperor as the bestower of status in the later Roman Empire. The emperors of the sixth century and later all would benefit from their examples of how to use the status of others as a means of maintaining their own status.

EPILOGUE

In the sixth century, Zeno's regulation was slightly revised. In 537, Justinian decreed, "The patrician distinction is to outrank the consular dignity... If anyone, moreover, is endowed with illustrious rank, let him be allowed to receive the codicils of the patriciate, even if he is not among the consulars or praefectorians, which a constitution of Zeno of divine memory mistakenly required. Indeed, it is sufficient in obtaining the dignity of the patriciate that individuals only be adorned with illustrious rank"[96].

Justinian's revision seems to recognize that there had been something devious in Zeno's regulation. Perhaps it was occasioned by lower-ranking *inlustres* who were not pleased with the prospect of being required to pay a hundred pounds of gold just to become eligible for the patriciate. Or perhaps the pressure on the emperor to make even more extensive grants of the patriciate just became too great for him to withstand, especially in the light of his forthcoming cessation of grants of the ordinary consulate to citizens, which took *de facto* effect in 541.

96 "patriciatus infulas consulari fastigio anteponi ... si qui autem illustri dignitate decorati sunt, liceat eis patriciatus codicillos accipere, etsi non consulares vel praefectorii existant, quod constitutio divae memoriae Zenonis irrite postulabat. sufficit etenim in patriciatus honorem capiendum, ut tantummodo illustri dignitate quidam decoretur" (*Nov. Just.* 62). Justinian's terms, of course, were much less restrictive: illustrious rank was easily obtainable — if one had the wherewithal — by any number of means. This decree has led some to suggest that Zeno's inclusion of masters of soldiers and masters of offices is an interpolation: see Jones, *LRE* p. 1225 n. 28.

Fifth-Century Patricians and Honorary Consuls

Name	Area	Offices/Honors	Patriciate
		EAST	
		Arcadius (395-408)	
Eutropius 1	E	PSC E 395-9, Cos 399	Patr by 399
		Theodosius II (402-450)	
Anthemius 1	E	CSL 400, PPOOr 405-414, Cos 405	Patr by 406
Aurelianus 3	E	Mag.Off., QSP, PVC, PPOr 399, Cos 400, PPO 414-6	Patr by 415
Lausus 1	E	PSC 420, Patr (Cod37, Dunlap 196)	Patr c.420
Antiochus 5	E	Cubic 404-14, PSC & Patr c.421	Patr by 421
Procopius 2	E	Dux 422, Patr & MVMOr 422-4	Patr 422
Helion 1	E	Comes & MagOff 414-427	Patr 424/425
Taurus 4	E	Cos 428, PPOOr 433-4, Patr 433/4, PPOII 455, d449	Patr by 433
Merobaudes	W	Com. consis. 435, Patr ? 437 in east, MVM 443	Patr ? 437
Cyrus 7	E	PVC 426, PVC II & PPO 439-441, Cos 441, Bish 443	Patr 439/41
Florentius 7	E	PVC 422, PPO 428-430, Cos 429, PPO 438-9	Patr 444/8
Senator 4	E	Cos 436	Patr by 446/7
Areobindus 2	E	Comes E 422, Cos 434, MVM 434-49, Patr-447, d449	Patr by 447
Fl Anatolius 10	E	MVM E 433-c. 446, Cos 440, Patr 447, MVM 450-1	Patr by 447
Nomus 1	E	MagOff 443-6, Cos 445	Patr 448
		Theodosius II or Marcian	
Antiochus 10	E	PPO Or 448	Patr 448/451
Fl Zeno 6	E	MVMOr 447-51, Cos 448	Patr 448/451
Protogenes	E	PPO, PPO II 448-449, Cos 449	Patr 449/451
Aspar	E	Comes & MVM 431-471, Cos 434	Patr by 451
		Marcian (450-457)	
Anthemius 3	E	Comes 453/4, MVM 454-67, Cos 455, Aug 467-72	Patr c.454

Theodosius II, Marcian, or Leo

Ardabur 1	E Praetor 434, Cos 447, MVMOr 453-66	Patr by 459

Leo (457-474)

Constantinus 22	E PPO 447, PPOII 456, Cos 457, Patr, PPOIII 459	Patr after 457
Tatianus 1	E ?Gov Car, PVC 450-2, Patr 464, Cos 466	Patr 464
Basiliscus 2	E MVM E 464-8, Cos 465, Patr, MVM 468, Aug 475-6	Patr 465/468
Dioscorus 5	E gramm., PVC by 467, PPO 472-5, PPOII 489, Cos Hon	&Patr 467/72
Hilarianus	E Patr by 470, Com&MagOff 470/4	Patr by 470
Zeno 7	E MVM 467-71,MVM 474,Cos 469, Patr 471/4,Aug 474	Patr 471/4
Fl Marcianus 17	E *Cos 469, MVM&Patr 471/4, Cos II 472*	*Patr 471/4*

Leo or Zeno

Iulius Nepos	E MVMDal ?468-74, Patr 474, Aug 474-80	Patr by 474
Dagalaiphus 2	E **Cos** 461	Patr by 475/6
Claudius	E QSP & Patr 475/6	Patr by 475/6
Anthemius 9	E **Cos** 515;?=Anthemius 5	Patr by 475/6
Theagenes	E Philosopher, wealthy, Athenian Archon	Patr by ?476
Idacius	E Patr Macedonia, d.c. 477 (Fred 2.57, GestTheod)	Patr by c.477

Zeno (474-491)

Severus 8	E Patr 474, for embassy to Vandals	Patr 474
Odovacar	W Patr 476/7 by Zeno, Rex 474-493	Patr 476/7
Armatus	E MVM 469/474, MVM E 475-8, Cos 476	Patr c.476?
Theodericus 7	E Patr&MVM 476/7-8, etc., Cos 484, Rex 493-525	Patr 476/7
Epinicus	E CRP, CSL 474, PPO 475, Patr&Cos **Hon**, PVC 478	Patr 476/8?
Illus 1	E Patr 477, MagOff 477-481, Cos 478, MVM 481-3	Patr 477
Adamantius 2	E PVC 474/479, Patr by 479, **Cos Hon** 479	Patr by 479
Pamprepius	E QSP&Patr&**Cos Hon** 479, MagOff 484 (of Leontius)	Patr 479
Trocundes	E Com, MVM 479-82, Patr&Cos 482	Patr 479/482
Leontius 17	E MVM 484, Patr by 484, **Cos Hon** by 484, Aug 484-8	Patr by 484
Iustinianus 5	E PVC 474, **Cos Hon** by 484 (Zeno/Leontius), PSC 484	
Marsus	E **Cos Hon** by 484 (by Zeno or Leontius)	
Florus 3	E **Cos Hon** M/LV, father of Zeno's MVM in 474	
Pelagius 2	E Silent by 473, Patr by 490, d. 490	Patr by 490
Isaac 1	E Patr and **Cos Hon** LV	Patr LV

WEST

Honorius (395-423)

Iovius 3	W PPOII 407, PPOIt&Patr 409 (twice)	Patr 409
Dardanus	W Cons., Mag.scrin., QSP, PPO I, Patr&PPO II 412-3	Patr by 412
Constantius 17	W MVM 411-21, Patr 415, Cos 414, 417, 420, Aug 421	Patr 415-21
Sabinianus	W Patr (& MVM) c.409/22	Patr 409/22
Asterius 4	W Patr&MVM 420/422	Patr 420/22

Valentinian III (425-455)

Felix 14	W Patr&MVM 425-30, Patr&Cos 428, d. 430	Patr 428-30
Bonifatius 3	W Tr 417, Com 423-5, Com.dom.425-7, Patr&MVM 432	Patr 432
Aetius 7	W MVM 433-54, Patr 435, Cos 432, 437, 446 d.454	Patr 435-54
Maximus 22	W CSL,PVR,PPO 421/39, Cos 433,PROII 439,Cos 443	Patr 443/5
Sigisvultus	W Comes&MVM ?437/440-8, Cos 437	Patr by 446
Fl Albinus 10	W PVR 426, PPO 440, PPO II 443, Cos 444	Patr 445/6
Firminus 2	W PPO W 449-52	Patr 449/51
Val Adelfius 3	W PVR, Patr., Cos 451	Patr by 451
Opilio 1	W MagOff 449-50, Cos 453, ?PVR&Patr post-450	Patr after 450
Boethius 4	W PPO 454, Patr (Chr.Min., Sund. 57), d.454	Patr by 454
Olybrius 6	W Patr ?455, Cos 464, Aug 472	Patr 455?

Avitus (455-456)

Remistus 1	W Patr&MVM 455-6	Patr 455-6
Messianus 1	W Patr&MVM 456	Patr 456

Majorian (457-461)

Ricimer	W Com 456, MVM 456-7, Patr&MVM 457-72, Cos 459	Patr 457-72

Majorian or Severus

Basilius 11	W PROIt 458, PPO II 463-5, Cos 463	Patr 458/463

Anthemius (467-472)

[Ricimer]	[carried over from Majorian]	
Marcellinus 6	E Com 454, MVM 461-8,	Patr 468
Chilpericus 2	W Patr by 468, MVM Gall ?473-4	Patr by 468
Apollinaris 6	W Trib 455, Com 460, PVR 468, Patr 468, Bish 470	Patr 468
Magnus Felix 21	W PPO W 469	Patr 469
Romanus 4	W MagOff by 470,	Patr by 470
Severus 19	W patr. 467/470?, PVR and Cos 470	Patr 467/70?
Syagrius?	W "rex Romanorum", "patricius Romanorum"	Patr? 464/86

Olybrius (472)

[Ricimer]	(carried over from Majorian)	
Gundobadus	W MVMGall 472, Patr&MVM 472-4, d.516	Patr 472

Julius Nepos (474-480)

Ecdicius	W Patr&MVM 474-5	Patr 474
Orestes 2	W Not 449-52, Patr&MVM 475-6	Patr 475

Other Possibilities

Latinus	W Patr by 476, embassy to Zeno 476	Patr by 476
Basilius 12	W Cos 480, PPOIt 483	Patr by 483
Basilius 13	W PVR 484, Patr, Cos 484	Patr by 484
Ruf. Festus 5	W Cos 472, CapSen by 490, E embassies 490, 497	Patr by 497

Bold = Generals, Underscored = Barbarians
For details of all careers, see appropriate entries in *PLRE*.

Summary

Total nos. of:	PATRICIANS MADE			HONORARY CONSULS
	Senators	Generals	Indpt. Barbarians	
Honorius (395-423)	2	3	0	0
	5 over 28 years, or 0.18 per year			
Theodosius II and Marcian (402-457)	13	7	0	0
	19 over 55 years, or 0.35 per year			
Valentinian III (425-455)	7	4	0	0
	11 over 30 years, or 0.37 per year			
Leo and Zeno (457-491)	18	10	2*	9
	28 over 34 years, or 0.86 per year			
[cf. c476-480:	8 over 4 years, or 2.00 per year]			
Anthemius (467-472)	4	2	1	0
	6 over 5 years, or 1.15 per year			

*Both barbarians also are counted as generals, hence total of only 28.

ABBREVIATIONS, USED IN TABLE

Aug	Augustus
Bish	Bishop
Com	Comes
ComConsist	Comes consistorianus
ComDom	Comes domesticorum
Cons	Consularis
Cos	Consul
CRP	Comes rei privatae
CSL	Comes sacrarum largitionum
Cubic	Cubicularius
Gram	Grammaticus
MagMil, MVM	Magister (utriusque) militum / militiae
MagOff	Magister officiorum
MagScrin	Magister scriniorum
Patr	Patrician
PPO	Praefectus praetorio
PSC	Praepositus sacri cubiculi
PVC	Praefectus urbi Constantinopoleis
PVR	Praefectus urbi Romae
QSP	Quaestor sacri palatii
Silent	Silentiarius
Trib, Tr	Tribunus [et notarius]
v.c.	Vir clarissimus
v.i.	Vir inlustris
v.s.	Vir spectabilis